

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 6, 8-18, 22-24, 28, 29, 32-37, 39, 44 and 47 if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 19-21, 25-27, 30-31, 38, 40-43, 45-46 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,060,296 to Grube et al. (hereinafter "Grube"). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection for at least the reasons as set forth below.

In the response to the previous Office Action, Applicants argued that the present invention provides for a monitoring unit that monitors a status of an object device to produce a status signal representative of the status of the object device, such as whether the object device is in an active state, whether the object device is communicable with the mobile station, and/or whether the object device is connected to the mobile station. Further, a control unit is coupled to the monitoring unit for responding to the base station through a radio channel on the basis of the status signal when the base station calls the mobile station. Thus, the present invention lets the user respond to an incoming call without checking the status of the object device, regardless of the status of the object device.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner states that the features relied upon are not recited in the claims (whether the object device is in an active state, whether the object device is communicable with the mobile station, whether the object device is connected to the mobile

station, and lets the user respond to an incoming call without checking the status of the object device, regardless of the status of the object device).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misunderstood the arguments in the response. It is clear from the specification that the status of the object device means that the status indicates whether the object device is in an active state, whether the object device is communicable with the mobile station, and/or whether the object device is connected to the mobile station. Claims are interpreted in light of the specification, and the claim term “status”, when read in light of the specification, means whether the object device is in an active state, whether the object device is communicable with the mobile station, and/or whether the object device is connected to the mobile station. The specification, on page 7, lines 16-23, clearly teaches the above, and it does not need to be recited in the claims, as the word “status” is clearly defined in the specification and merely needs to be interpreted from the specification.

Also, the control unit coupled to the monitoring unit responds to the base station through a radio channel on the basis of the status signal when the base station calls the mobile station. Thus, the present invention lets the user respond to an incoming call without checking the status of the object device, regardless of the status of the object device. This is an advantage of the present invention because the control unit responds to the base station on the basis of the status signal. Because this advantage is found based on the fact that the control unit responds to the base station through the radio channel on the basis of the status signal, it does not mean the advantage has to be recited in the claims. Applicant’s arguments clearly establish that the control unit responds to a base station on the basis of the status signal when the base station calls the mobile station, and that this is not taught by Grube. There is no requirement in patent law that advantages of the invention be recited in the claims.

Further, the signals A and B of Grube are transmitted/received between a communication unit 103 and a repeater 102 connected to a resource controller 101 and carry a usage message 301 and an acknowledgment signal 302 for a channel assignment grant (See Col. 2, lines 64-68).

The status signal of the present invention, on the other hand, is used for communication between the mobile station and the object device coupled to the mobile station to represent the status of the object device, as recited in independent claims 1, 25, 26 and 45. In addition, such a status signal is effective to let a user respond to an incoming call without checking the status of the object device.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner consider the arguments in the previous response as well as the current response, and specifically, the arguments in regard to the “status” of an object device.

The present invention teaches a mobile station that monitors a status of an object device and produces a status signal. It is not related to two mobile stations communicating with each other, such as Grube. Further, the present invention teaches a control unit that responds to a base station on the basis of the status signal when the base station calls the mobile station. Thus, the base station is informed of the status of the object device when the base station calls the mobile station. Grube does not teach reporting a status of an object device to a base station when the base station calls a mobile station. Grube instead teaches a mobile station calling another mobile station through a resource controller, which simply grants a talk request and allows the two communication units to talk to each other. This is completely different than what is recited in the claims of the present invention.

Grube fails to teach monitoring a status of an object device to produce a status signal and responding to a base station on the basis of the status signal when the base station calls the

mobile station. Further, the Admitted Prior Art only teaches a picture terminal that can be connected to a mobile station to display a picture thereon (page 1, lines 1-19, as cited by the Examiner). Thus, the combination of references by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the elements of the present invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner has not cited any references that would render the communication system and method provided in claims 1-48 obvious. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 19-21, 25-27, 30-31, 38, 40-43, 45-46 and 48, and respectfully request allowance of claims 1-48.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Aasheesh V. Shravah
Registration No. 54,445

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

AVS:jam